REMARKS

Claims 1-14 are pending in this application.

I. Information Disclosure Statement

The Examiner is requested to consider the February 22, 2005 Information Disclosure Statement and the April 24, 2009 Information Disclosure Statement.

II. The Claims Comply With The Written Description Requirement

The Office Action rejects claims 1-14 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as allegedly not complying with the written description requirement. The Office Action alleges that there is no description in the specification for the features of "without stopping ..." (independent claim 1) and "which does not stop ..." (independent claim 14) and also alleges that s_{fmin} and s_{fmax} are not disclosed as being nonzero. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Independent claim 1 recites "lowering the speed of the feeding means without stopping the feeding means ..." and "changing the speed of the feeding means without stopping the feeding means ...". Independent claim 14, recites "the controller is arranged to give a speed reducing control command, which does not stop the feeding means, to the feeding means ..." and "the controller is arranged to give a speed changing control command, which does not stop the feeding means, to the feeding means ...".

These features are described in the specification at several places. At page 11, lines 18-20, the specification as filed states, for example, "if the microprocessor detects that the screen is overloaded the microprocessor control upon selection either stops the feeding equipment or decelerates its running speed" (emphasis added). This section describes stopping the feeding equipment and decelerating the feeding equipment as alternatives. As stated in the MPEP, "If alternative elements are positively recited in the specification, they may be explicitly excluded in the claims. See *In re Johnson*, 558 F.2d 1008, 1019, 194 USPQ

187, 196 (CCPA 1977) ("[the] specification, having described the whole, necessarily described the part remaining.")." (MPEP §2173.05(i)). Because the specification indicates that stopping the feeding equipment and decelerating the feeding equipment are alternative actions, the stopping of the feeding equipment can be excluded. The specification unequivocally describes decelerating instead of stopping, and thus describes decelerating without stopping.

Further sections of the specification as filed contrast stopping of the feeding equipment with changing the speed of the feeding equipment. At page 11, lines 21-22, the specification as filed states, for example, "In an optimal situation, the microprocessor only decelerates the feeding" (emphasis added). That is, in the situation to which the cited section relates, stopping of the feeding is optimally excluded.

At page 11, line 35 to page 12, line 1, relating to Fig. 4a, the specification as filed states, for example, that the control decelerates the running speed s_{fc} to the preset minimum value s_{fmin}. That is, in the situation to which the cited section relates, stopping of the feeding does not occur.

At page 12, lines 29-30, the specification as filed states, for example, "When this maximum time runs out, the control stops the feeding equipment entirely" (emphasis added). One of ordinary skill would have understood that, prior to the stopping, the equipment has been running in the situation where the screen drive system pressure p_{sm} has exceeded the maximum value p_{smax} preset in the control, but for a time less that t_{max}. That is, until t_{max} is reached, the action of stopping the feeding equipment is not implemented.

At page 13, lines 4-7, in reference to Fig. 4b, the specification as filed states, for example, "When the pressure p_{sm} exceeds the maximum value p_{smax} preset in the control, the control decelerates the running speed s_{fc} of the feeding equipment from the preset maximum value s_{fmax} to the preset minimum value s_{fmin}".

The figures also contrast stopping of the feeding equipment and changing the speed of the feeding equipment as actions done in different phases of operation, for example. Specifically, the action of not stopping the feeding mechanism is shown in Figs. 4a and 4b. In Fig. 4a, the speed of the feeding equipment is indicated by the broken line s_{fc}. When the screen drive system pressure p_{sm} exceeds the maximum pressure p_{smax} set by the control system, the speed of the feeding equipment is reduced to s_{fmin}. Further, when the pressure has been above p_{smax} for a long enough time, time t_{max}, the speed is decreased to zero (stopped). One of ordinary skill would have understood that Fig. 4a shows that the feeding equipment is not stopped in the phases prior to the situation where the screen drive system pressure p_{sm} exceeds the maximum pressure p_{smax} for a time t_{max}. Fig. 4b similarly shows that the speed of the feeding equipment varies between s_{fmax} and s_{fmin} without going to zero s long as the screen drive system pressure p_{sm} does not exceed p_{smax} for a time t_{max} or more. The speed of the feeding equipment is set to zero (stopped) only after the maximum allowable time t_{max} is exceeded.

Figs. 4a and 4b further indicate that s_{fmin} and s_{fmax} are not zero. For example, the feeding equipment speed s_{fc} is shown as having values lower than both of s_{fmin} and s_{fmax}.

Because the specification and figures clearly indicate that stopping of the feeding equipment is not used in at least one operational phase (for example, when the screen drive system pressure p_{sm} does not exceed p_{smax} for a time t_{max} or more), stopping of the feeding equipment can be properly excluded as recited in the claims.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants request withdrawal of the rejection.

III. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,

James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Jonathan H. Backenstose
Registration No. 47,399

JAO:JHB/mab

Attachment:
Petition for Extension of Time

Date: May 5, 2009

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 320850
Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION
Please grant any extension necessary for entry;
Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461